

## **REMARKS**

### **Interview Summary**

Applicant thanks Examiner Kane and Examiner Del Sole for their time on November 6, 2007, to conduct a telephonic interview with the undersigned and the inventor. During the interview, Montville and claim 1 were discussed. It was agreed that the claims would be amended to recite use, by the service, of a public/private key associated with the service (and not associated with any particular participant – sender or receiver). No exhibits were shown or discussed.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 47 has been amended to clarify that, at the receiver's side, a request is sent (not processed) to obtain contact information about the sender from the service.

### **Claim Rejections – Section 112**

Claim 11 is cancelled.

The claims have been amended to remove the word “nominally.”

Claim 49 has been amended to recite that the advertising is “sender advertising.”

### **Double Patenting**

Claim 11 is cancelled.

Claim 8 is cancelled.

Claims 21 and 22 are not duplicate. Claim 21 recites associating a physical location with the sender, whereas claim 22 recites determining how the sender may be later located.

Claim 41 is cancelled.

### **Prior-Art Based Rejections**

Claim 1, and other claims as appropriate, have been amended as agreed to during the interview, to recite use, by the service, of a private key associated with the service. Furthermore, the receiving side uses a complementary public key associated with the service. Note, for example, paragraph [0032] of Applicant's specification, reciting in part “the public key associated with the service 104 is used to decode the service-determined result incorporated into the received e-mail message, to determine a decoded service-determined result.”

The Examiners agreed during the interview that this feature distinguishes over Montville. None of the secondary references relied upon (i.e., in the obviousness rejections) disclose or suggest such a feature.

### **CONCLUSION**

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,  
BEYER WEAVER LLP

/ASH/  
Alan S. Hodes  
Reg. No. 38,185

P.O. Box 70250  
Oakland, CA 94612-0250  
408-255-8001